

## **TABLES**

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Compliance  
January 2006**

Extraction Well Network	Compliance Criteria Met (yes/no)	Comments
<b>Flow Rate Performance - Target Extraction Rate</b>		
Newmark North Extraction Well Network	No	The City is unable to sustain the three month rolling average Target Extraction Rate for the Newmark North extraction well network (see Table 2-3). A letter informing the EPA and DTSC of this condition was sent out on July 25, 2005. An evaluation of the conditions causing this flow rate variance was submitted December 6, 2005.
Newmark Plume Front Extraction Well Network	NA	Flow rate performance criteria are not applicable until the Muscoy OU is declared Operational and Functional
Muscoy Plume Extraction Well Network	NA	Flow rate performance criteria are not applicable until the Muscoy OU is declared Operational and Functional
<b>Flow Performance - Particle Tracking</b>		
Newmark Plume Front Extraction Well Network	NA	Flow performance criteria for the Newmark OU IRA are not applicable until particle tracking methodology proposed in the Operational Sampling and Analysis Plan is approved.
Muscoy Plume Extraction Well Network	NA	Flow performance criteria are not applicable until the Muscoy OU is declared Operational and Functional and the addendum OSAP is approved.
<b>Contaminant Performance - Down gradient Monitoring Wells</b>		
Newmark Plume Front Extraction Well Network	NA	The first monitoring well sampling round for evaluating contaminant performance was conducted in November 2005. Laboratory analysis was performed by EPA's contract laboratory with EPA oversight. The analytical data will be reported within 30 days of receiving validated data from EPA.
Muscoy Plume Extraction Well Network	NA	Contaminant performance criteria are not applicable until the Muscoy OU is declared Operational and Functional

**Notes:**

NA - not applicable (see comment for reason)

**Table 2-1**  
**Summary of Newmark OU O&M - Extraction Wells**

Reporting Period: January 1, 2006 through January 31, 2006  
System Operational & Functional Date: October 1, 2000 <sup>(1)</sup>  
Operations Completed: 5 years 4 months

<b>Newmark North Plant Extraction Well Network (EPA 006, EPA 007, Newmark 3)</b>	
Description Routine Maintenance Performed	Daily equipment checks performed (see DHS report), monthly hands on physical, annual oil change, semi-annual check of VFD
Description of Problems Encountered	1. EPA 006 is operating on an approximate 12 hour daily schedule due to the pump breaking suction after extended pumping periods. The break in suction is believed to result from declining water levels as reported in our December 6, 2005 submission to modify Target Extraction Rates. The pump was last tested on June 30, 2005, and found to be operating normally. The break in suction does not appear to result from any mechanical problem with the pump.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	None
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	Unable to meet the three month rolling average Target Extraction Rate (see notification letter to the EPA/DTSC dated July 25, 2005). North Plant Sustainable Rate letter was submitted to EPA/DTSC on December 6, 2005 seeking a downward adjustment in the Target Extraction Rate to conform extraction rates to historical performance of the wells and declining water levels in the area.
<b>Newmark Plume Front Extraction Well Network (EPA 001, EPA 002, EPA 003, EPA 004, EPA 005)</b>	
Description Routine Maintenance Performed	Daily equipment checks performed (see DHS report), monthly hands on physical, annual oil change, semi-annual check of VFD
Description of Problems Encountered	EPA 003 flow is 1560 GPM due to falling water table.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	EPA Wells 001,002,004 and 005 increased flow to 1600 GPM to make up for lost flow of EPA Well 003.
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	None

(1) The USEPA declared the Newmark OU Operational and Functional on October 1 ,2000.

**Table 2-2**  
**Summary of Extraction Well Flow Data**  
**January 2006**

Extraction Well	Monthly Extracted Water Volumes (acre-ft)	Average Monthly Flow Rate (gpm)	Cumulative Volume Extracted <sup>(1)</sup> (acre-ft)	Number of Days in Month =	31
				Monthly Run Time (days)	Monthly Down Time (days) <sup>(2)</sup>
Newmark North Plant Extraction Well Network					
EPA 006	59.0	430	3,605	15.6	15.4
EPA 007	191.0	1,394	7,971	30.7	0.3
Newmark 3	127.0	927	5,533	31.0	0.0
Network Total	376.9	2,751	17,109		
Newmark Plume Front Extraction Well Network					
EPA 001	214.1	1,563	10,424	30.6	0.4
EPA 002	218.8	1,597	11,519	30.8	0.2
EPA 003	204.8	1,495	13,093	30.1	0.9
EPA 004	218.6	1,595	12,354	30.9	0.1
EPA 005	225.5	1,646	11,213	30.9	0.1
Network Total	1081.7	7,895	58,603		

**Notes:**

Per the terms of the Statement of Work, once Muscoy is declared O&F the City will be required to demonstrate flow compliance with each extraction well networks Target Extraction Rates considering the specified maintenance allowances. At such time the City will provide the supporting calculations in a tabular format.

NA - Not available

(1) - Cumulative volume extracted since Newmark OU System Operations Date (October 1, 2000)

(2) - The run time meters are read on the 1st of each month as close to the same time of day as possible. However, the total monthly run time for each extraction well may be higher or lower than the actual run time due to the effect of the difference in time of the day the field measurements are recorded for the beginning and end of the month.

**Table 2-3**  
**Three Month Rolling Average Extraction Volume and Extraction Rate Calculations**  
**January 2006**

Extraction Well	Run Times (Days)				Total Down Time For Last Three Months	Extraction Volumes (acre ft)				Extraction Rates (gpm)			
	November 2005	December 2005	January 2006	Total For Last Three Months		November 2005	December 2005	January 2006	Total Pumpage Last Three Months	Three Month Rolling Average Extraction Rate	Design Extraction Rate (DER)	Target Extraction Rate (TER) <sup>(1)</sup>	Difference Between Three Month Rolling Average and TER
Days in Period >>	30	31	31	92									
<b>Newmark North Plant Extraction Well Network<sup>(3)</sup></b>													
EPA 006 <sup>(2)</sup>	14.4	16.0	15.6	45.9	46.1	53.2	59.8	59.0	171.9				
EPA 007	29.3	31.0	31.0	91.2	0.8	179.6	190.4	191.0	561.0				
Newmark 3	29.6	31.0	31.0	91.5	0.5	118.7	125.6	127.0	371.3				
<b>Network Total</b>						<b>351.5</b>	<b>375.8</b>	<b>376.9</b>	<b>1104.2</b>	<b>2715.7</b>	<b>3900.0</b>	<b>3529.1</b>	<b>-813.3</b>

**Notes:**

NA - Not Applicable

(1) TERs are adjusted for the maintenance allowance.

(2) This extraction well can only be operated 12 hours a day in order to avoid pump cavitation created by the depleted aquifer conditions.

CD Consent Decree

DER Design Extraction Rate

gpm gallons per minute

O&F Operable and Functional

SOW Statement of Work (entered with CD March 23, 2005)

TER Target Extraction Rate

**Table 2- 4**  
**Extraction Well Monitoring Results - PCE and TCE**  
**January 2006**

Extraction Well	Date Sampled	PCE Concentration (µg/L)	TCE Concentration (µg/L)
<b>Newmark North Extraction Well Network</b>			
EPA 006	1/18/2006	2.5	<0.5
EPA 007	1/18/2006	3.5	0.5
Newmark 3	1/18/2006	1.9	<0.5
<b>Newmark Plume Front Extraction Well Network</b>			
EPA 001	1/18/2006	4.9	1.6
EPA 002	1/18/2006	5.3	1.7
EPA 003	1/18/2006	3.4	0.9
EPA 004	1/18/2006	1.2	<0.5
EPA 005	1/18/2006	<0.5	<0.5

**Notes:**

These data have been collected and validated using standard SBMWD protocol as required under SBMWDs DHS Permit. Once the project QA/QC Plan has been prepared and approved, SBMWD will adhere to the QA/QC plan when sampling the extraction wells and validating laboratory data.  
 NM - Not monitored during the reporting period.

**Table 3-1  
Summary of Newmark OU O&M - GAC Treatment Plants**

**Reporting Period: January 1, 2006 through January 31, 2006**  
**System Operational & Functional Date: October 1, 2000<sup>(1)</sup>**  
**Operations Completed: 5 years 4 months**

<b>Newmark North GAC Treatment Plant</b>	
Description Routine Maintenance Performed	Daily equipment checks performed (see DHS report)
Description of Problems Encountered	Encountering trouble with lifting vault lids for Chlorine injection/Cla-valve. Lids are extremely difficult to open. The inspection on December 21, 2005 determined that the lids must be replaced with torsion assist lids. Anticipated repair scheduled for February 2006.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	None
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	None
<b>17th Street GAC Treatment Plant</b>	
Description Routine Maintenance Performed	Daily equipment checks performed (see DHS report)
Description of Problems Encountered	None
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	None
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	None
<b>Waterman GAC Treatment Plant</b>	
Description Routine Maintenance Performed	Daily equipment checks performed (see DHS report)
Description of Problems Encountered	Encountering trouble with lifting vault lids for Chlorine injection/Cla-valve. Lids are extremely difficult to open. The inspection on December 21, 2005 determined that the lids must be replaced with torsion assist lids. Anticipated repair scheduled for February 2006.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	None
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	None

**Table 3-2**  
**Summary of Treatment Plant Flow Data and Mass Removal Estimates**  
**January 2006**

Treatment Plant	Extraction Wells Treated By Plant	Treated Water Volumes (acre-ft)	Average Monthly Flow Rate (gpm)	Estimated Monthly GAC Mass Removal <sup>(1)</sup> (lbs)	Estimated Cumulative GAC Mass Removal <sup>(2)</sup> (lbs)
Newmark North GAC Treatment Plant	EPA 006, EPA 007 and Newmark 3	376.9	2,751.1	3.8	284.2
17th Street GAC Treatment Plant	EPA 003	204.8	1,494.5	0.6	196.5
Waterman GAC Treatment Plant <sup>(3)</sup>	EPA 002, EPA 004 and EPA 005	662.8	4,838.1	5.4	478.6
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,244.5</b>	<b>9,083.7</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>959.3</b>

**Notes:**

(1) - Monthly mass removal estimates are based on Monthly Treatment Summary sheets documented in monthly DHS reports.

(2) - Cumulative mass removal estimates are for the period since Newmark was declared O&F (October 1, 2000). The historical estimate prior to Consent decree entry is based on a combination of carbon life loading history data and Monthly Treatment Summary spreadsheet.

(3) - Since the beginning of March extracted groundwater from EW-1 has been diverted to the 19th Street Treatment Plant. Therefore, the sum of volume of groundwater extracted from Newmark OU wells is different then the sum of the volume treated by the Newmark OU treatment plants.



**Table 3-3  
Treatment Plant Monitoring Results - PCE and TCE  
January 2006**

Treatment Plant	Date Sampled	PCE Concentration (µg/L)	TCE Concentration (µg/L)
<b>Newmark North GAC Treatment Plant</b>			
Combined Extraction Well Influent	18-Jan-06	3.2	0.5
Lead Vessel Effluent 1	18-Jan-06	<0.5	0.6
Lead Vessel Effluent 2	18-Jan-06	1.2	<0.5
Lead Vessel Effluent 3	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
Lead Vessel Effluent 4	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
Lead Vessel Effluent 5	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
Lead Vessel Effluent 6	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
Lead Vessel Effluent 7	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
Combined Treatment Plant Effluent	5-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	12-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	26-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
<b>17th Street GAC Treatment Plant</b>			
Combined Extraction Well Influent	5-Jan-06	4.0	0.9
Lead Vessel Effluent 1	5-Jan-06	1.3	1.0
Lead Vessel Effluent 2	5-Jan-06	1.0	1.0
Lead Vessel Effluent 3	5-Jan-06	1.2	1.0
Combined Treatment Plant Effluent	5-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	12-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	26-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
<b>Waterman GAC Treatment Plant</b>			
Combined Extraction Well Influent	5-Jan-06	2.3	0.8
Lead Vessel Effluent 1	5-Jan-06	2.8	1.1
Lead Vessel Effluent 2	5-Jan-06	2.0	1.1
Lead Vessel Effluent 3	5-Jan-06	2.6	1.1
Lead Vessel Effluent 4	5-Jan-06	3.1	1.1
Lead Vessel Effluent 5	5-Jan-06	2.8	1.1
Lead Vessel Effluent 6	5-Jan-06	4.3	2.2
Lead Vessel Effluent 7	5-Jan-06	3.5	1.2
Lead Vessel Effluent 8	5-Jan-06	3.4	1.4
Combined Treatment Plant Effluent	5-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	12-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	18-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5
	26-Jan-06	<0.5	<0.5

**Notes:**

These data have been collected and validated using standard SBMWD protocol as required under SBMWDs DHS Permit. Once the project QA/QC Plan has been prepared and approved, SBMWD will adhere to the QA/QC plan when sampling the extraction wells and validating data.

NM - Not monitored during the reporting period

**Table 4-1**  
**Summary of Newmark OU O&M - Water Level Monitoring**

**Reporting Period:** January 1, 2006 through January 31, 2006  
**System Operation Date:** October 1, 2000  
**Operations Completed:** 5 years 4 months

Newmark and Muscoy OU Monitoring Wells	
Description of Routine Monitoring and Maintenance Performed	Periodic download of RTU based water level data and RTU hardware, software and sensors checks. Collection of manual water levels to verify RTU based readings.
Description of Problems Encountered	Defective level sensor at MW13A. Replaced sensor on 1/25/06.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	New high speed radio was tested using MW10. Results were very good for overall wireless communication especially with collecting water logs over the wireless network.
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	MW13PA level sensor was found defective on 1/25/06. Data was not collected from the time the sensor malfunctioned until it was replaced on 1/26/06.
Newmark and Muscoy OU Extraction Wells	
Description Routine Monitoring and Maintenance Performed	Periodic download of water level data from RTUs as part of the completion of the Muscoy OU startup aquifer testing (per the schedule in the EPA/URS Field Sampling Plan) and less frequently for extraction wells monitored as part of Newmark OU IRA operations.
Description of Problems Encountered	EPA 001 had a defective radio and was replaced. No data were lost.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	None
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	None. Daily water level readings were collected each day as required by the SOW.
Site-Wide Monitoring Wells	
Description Routine Monitoring and Maintenance Performed	Collected monthly manual water level measurements on January 25, 2006
Description of Problems Encountered	The City is unable to collect Site-Wide manual water levels from some of the wells designated in the SOW due to access limitations, water level depths beyond the length of the sounding tape or omissions. See list below.
Description of Process Improvements Implemented	None
Deviations from the Operational Requirements of the Consent Decree	The Site-Wide manual water levels were not collected from the following wells: MW 126 (well appears to be dry), PZ-124 (well appears to be dry,). Muscoy Mutual No. 5 (air line installed by Muscoy Mutual prevents the lowering of the sounding tape and we are not authorized to remove. The City is in the process of evaluating alternatives). 31st and Mt View is located in a confined space, the City is in the process of developing an alternative measuring method to monitor this well.
Wells Monitored Voluntarily	
Description of Routine Monitoring and Maintenance Performed	Collected monthly manual water level measurements. Downloaded electronic water level data from USGS website.
Description of Problems Encountered	None

**Table 6-1**  
**Schedule of Upcoming O&M, Monitoring and Reporting Events**  
**Planning Period: February 2006/March 2006**

Task/Item	Planned Event
<b>Newmark OU Extraction Wells</b>	
Pump/Well Maintenance	Pumping equipment change out EPA 003 - anticipated during winter/spring 2006
Electrical/Controller Maintenance	Routine. Replaced faulty motor at EPA6
SCADA System and RTU System Maintenance	Overall hardware and system checks for each well. Included and tested each well RTUs in the new radio system and results were very good.
Extraction Well Monitoring	Download water level data and check RTU offsets.
Other	None
<b>Newmark OU Treatment Plants</b>	
Carbon Change Outs	None
Electrical/Controller Maintenance	None
SCADA System and RTU System Maintenance	Overall hardware and system checks for each well. Included and tested each well RTUs in the new radio system and results were very good.
Treatment System Monitoring	Routine treatment plant sampling
Other	None
<b>Monitoring Wells</b>	
SCADA System and RTU System Maintenance	Continued work on RTU - SCADA communications and system reliability. Troubleshoot and repair RTUs and RTU programming as needed.
Water Level Monitoring - SCADA Wells	Download water level data and check elevation offsets. Troubleshoot and repair transducers as needed.
Water Level Monitoring - Site-Wide Well	Collect monthly manual water levels
Monitoring Well sampling	EPA/URS sampling will be performed in support of Muscoy OU one-year performance evaluation.
Other	None
<b>Project Documents</b>	
Progress Report - February 2006	Scheduled to be submitted March 30, 2006. (1)
<b>Community Relations</b>	
Fact Sheets	None planned
Community Meetings	None planned

(1) The SOW requires monthly progress reports be submitted 45 days after the subject data period. The SOW also requires flow and water level data be submitted 30 days after the reporting period. This progress report includes both data sets and therefore must be submitted in compliance with the most restrictive due date which is 30 days after the reporting period.

**Table 6-2**  
**Submittal of Deliverables/Documents For 2005/2006**

Deliverable	Date Submitted	Status
Groundwater Modeling Work Plan	April 15, 2005	Approved by EPA in Correspondence Dated May 26, 2005
Transmittal of Treatment Plant and Extraction Well Flow Data - March/April 2005	May 31, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
Progress Report - March/April 2005	June 14, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC. This is the first monthly progress report submitted. Review and comment pending.
Letter requesting an extension for QA/QC Plan Submittal	June 15, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC./ Verbal extension granted by EPA June 2005
Health and Safety Plan	June 17, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
Operations and Maintenance Plan	June 17, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
Time Line and Schedule	June 21, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
Staffing Plan	June 21, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
Progress Report - May 2005	June 30, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
North Plant Target Extraction Rate Notification	July 25, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC.
Progress Report - June 2005	July 31, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Progress Report - July 2005	August 31, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Letter requesting an extension for Baseline Mitigation Plan Submittal	September 22, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC/ Extension approved by EPA- September 27,2005
Progress Report - August 2005	September 30, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Letter requesting an extension for the OSAP and the QA/QC Plan	October 5, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC/ Extension approved by EPA- October 14,2005
Progress Report - September 2005	October 31, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Letter requesting an extension for the OSAP and the QA/QC Plan	November 8, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC/ Extension approved by EPA- November 17,2005
Coordination Plan for November Sampling Event	November 8, 2005	Submitted to EPA
Operational Sampling Analysis Plan (OSAP)	November 8, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan (QA/QC)	November 21, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Progress Report - October 2005	November 30, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
North Plant Target Extraction Rate -Sustainable Rates Letter	December 5, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Preliminary Review of the Muscoy OU Capture Analysis Reports (August and September 2005)	December 6, 2005	Submitted To EPA and DTSC
Progress Report - November 2005	December 20, 2005	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Letter requesting an extension of time for the Baseline Mitigation Plan	January 19, 2006	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Progress Report - December 2005	January 30, 2006	Submitted to EPA and DTSC
Progress Report - January 2006	February 28, 2006	Submitted to EPA and DTSC

**Table 6-3**  
**Summary of Newmark Groundwater Flow Model Construction Activities**  
**January 2006**

Modeling Component	Progress Summary
<b>Activities Conducted During The Reporting Period</b>	
Data Compilation	1) Prepared data sets for importation into the model 2) Prepared data trend analysis in preparation for model input
Conceptual Model Development	1) Documented conceptual model approach, process and results 2) Performed Quality Control review of lithology model in the vicinity of the IRA system through detailed analysis of spinner logs, chemistry data, and head data
Model Construction	1) Imported draft model layers into model 2) Prepared data sets for redefined stress periods (monthly from 1983 through 2005) 3) Compiled data sets for multi-node well package 4) Compiled land use coverage for evaluation of precipitation and/or return flow evaluation
Model Calibration	1) Compiled comments from Draft Calibration Plan 2) Compiled and reviewed data sets for inclusion as calibration targets 3) Calibration continued with evaluating each of the above described runs with the USGS model for calibration of water balance and head values
Meetings	No meetings scheduled this period
<b>Activities Planned/Conducted in February and March, 2006</b>	
Data Compilation	1) Continue to catalogue data received to date 2) Update data sets with 2005 data, as it is received
Conceptual Model Development	1) Distribute the Conceptual Model Technical Memorandum to TAC
Model Construction	1) Continue to methodically refine model as follows: a) Incorporation of hydrostratigraphy detailed in the conceptual model b) Refine time steps
Model Calibration	1) Incorporate comments to the Calibration Plan and issue distribute response to comments 2) Initiate execution of the Calibration Plan
Meetings	1) Working Group Meeting tentatively scheduled for February 2) Model Progress TAC meeting tentatively scheduled for March

**Note:**

The Newmark Groundwater Flow Model is being co-developed with the Regional Basin Flow Model. As such, the City of San Bernardino Water Department's consultant (SECOR) is working jointly with San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District's consultant (GEOSCIENCE Support Services) to fulfill both parties' modeling objectives. This table provides a summary of the activities performed and activities planned in support of this joint venture.